

I am writing to the Committee to OBJECT to Raised Bill 1076 and all similar bills seeking to restrict the right of law-abiding to gun owners. I am sorry I can not deliver these comments in person today.

I OBJECT not only on the grounds that such laws VIOLATE my federal and Connecticut constitutional rights but also because such restrictions WILL NOT REDUCE THE GREATEST CAUSES OF GUN-RELATED INJURY AND DEATH: SUICIDE AND CRIMINAL USE OF FIREARM

The following is a critical and COMMON SENSE review of the DEMOCRATS' CONSENSUS PROPOSAL released 05March, many of whose ideas have been incorporated into Raised Bill 1076 and other bills being discussed today.

Given the similarities of these provisions with the proposals of Gov. Malloy, CT Against Gun Violence and March of Change, this review applies to their ideas as well.

A COMMON SENSE perspective assumes that making our communities “safe from gun violence” means seeking to reduce the instances of injuries and deaths as a result of ALL discharge of firearms. This would include gun injury and death caused by suicide, accident, domestic/known shooter, street crime and rampage killer. No?

Based on a range of statistics from CAGV and other sources included at the bottom of this review, I offer some general conclusions about gun violence in Connecticut:

- Suicides make up the majority of gun deaths in the USA and Connecticut (55-60%)**
- Handguns are responsible for the vast majority of gun homicides**
- Gun homicides are concentrated in our biggest cities**
- African American and Latino men are the majority of victims**
- White males are the greatest suicide risks**
- 85%+ “of gun crimes are committed by people who cannot legally purchase guns” (long-time CAGV claim)**
- Long guns (rifles) are used in a very small number of homicides**
- Accidental and domestic violence gun deaths are small % overall**
- Mass killings are an infinitesimally small number of total gun homicides**
- AR-15 style rifles are rarely used in crimes and even mass murders**
- The risk of being a victim of gun violence in suburban Connecticut is very low.**

In my review, I assume that past comments of CAGV executives and various Democrat legislators are true in that they have respect for citizens' right to bear arms as articulated in both the US Constitution's Second Amendment and Article 1, Section 15 of the Connecticut State Constitution.

At its most basic level, "common sense" means sound and prudent judgment based on a simple perception of the situation or facts. In the crafting of laws, that would mean laws that will:

- Be crafted based on facts**
- Be clear and unambiguous while avoiding being capricious, arbitrary or emotional**
- Be effective in attaining its goals**
- Be enforceable, be economically viable and/or enjoy fully funded enforcement**
- Avoid adversely impacting currently law-abiding citizens**
- Avoid violating the US Constitution's 2nd, 4th, 5th and 14th Amendments as well as the Connecticut State Constitution's Article 1, Section 15**

So in light of the above, a critical review of the major provisions of the Hartford Democrats' proposal will evaluate them in relation to:

Suicide – Will provision reduce gun-related suicide? FAIL

Accidents – Will provisions reduce gun-related accidents? FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – Will provision reduce injury/death? FAIL

Street gun-crime – Will provision impact illegal guns in illegal hands? FAIL

Rampage killer – Will provision stop the launch of a psychotic killer? FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – Will provision reduce body count of a mass killing? FAIL

Newtown – Would provision have stopped the Sandy Hook Killer? FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – Will provision adversely impact law-abiding citizens' right to self-defense? FAIL

Using the above criteria, the central tenants of the Hartford Democrats March 5th proposal FAILS on all fact-based and practical grounds. Its provisions will have NO CURRENT IMPACT on the most common causes of gun violence, injury or death: suicides and criminal use of firearms. I

Bill 1076 and the Democrats' call for a ban on misnamed “assault weapons” is over-reach given that such weapons are rarely used in crimes, whether street crimes or even rampage killings. It seems to escape those calling for such bans that Adam Lanza was armed with two handguns and left his magazine-fed shotgun in his car, all of which would have been used with equally devastating effect had he been unable to use the Bushmaster rifle. It also ignores Scalia’s “in common use” language in the Heller decision.

Worse, the Democrats' proposals are most problematic because they would interfere with the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens to arm themselves as they see fit for self-defense purposes. Many of these provisions will have no bearing on criminal gun usage but will negatively impact the law-abiding gun owner's ability to enjoy their sport or even defend themselves.

In the wake of Newtown, the discussion on gun violence has been emotion wrought and consisted of many calls to “do something, anything” to assuage the misery of those directly impacted and console those worried about a repeat. This is understandable, if misguided.

However, the Sandy Hook massacre has also given renewed momentum to the professional gun-control lobby who has leveraged this tragedy to push their ineffectual 25-year-old ideas that have failed across the country. If more and more restrictive laws work, please ask the most verbal gun-control advocates to explain Chicago to us all. No, this has become about “control” and not mitigating the most common form of gun violence. Organizations like CAGV and the Brady Commission seem to have run out of “common sense” changes and the bulk of their current demands will than have little to no material and lasting impact on

the major causes of gun violence and yet will negatively impact law-abiding gun owners. As one observer commented to me recently, clearly CAGV has morphed from a true advocacy group addressing common gun violence to a partisan organization that is entirely political in the entire blue-people versus red-people political context – INDEED.

Worse, I sense that this has become an ideological battle of “us vs them”, “blue people vs red people”, “yuppies vs clingers”, “Venus vs Mars”, “living-document vs strict construction”, “trust-government vs trust-self” and so on.

Thus, I have to believe that this argument, and it is an argument and not a discussion, has become driven more by deep and stubborn ideology than by COMMON SENSE. Otherwise I can not explain how so many intelligent people on the gun-control side can put aside logic and continue to argue for measures that have not worked in the past and, as I have shown above, will have little to no impact on the major causes of gun violence.

In closing, i have four school-aged kids that i need to be safe and the majority of these measures discussed below will do little to make that them safer anytime in their childhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Paine

SUPPLEMENTAL DISCUSSION - DETAILS ON THE ABOVE

The following are the details of the various provisions of the Democrats’ proposals, many of which have been incorporated into Raised Bill 1076 and other bills currently under consideration. Given their length, I am not going to quote their language verbatim below.

1) Expand the definition of “assault weapon”, require non-transferable registration of existing weapons, ban future in-state civilian transfers but allow such weapons to continue to be manufactured in Connecticut.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – NEGATIVE IMPACT (prospective ownership)

Rifles of the AR (Armalite Rifle) and Kalishnikov design are not instruments widely used widely in suicide nor criminal acts. According to Mother Jones, AR-design rifles are rarely used in mass murders with most such events involving handguns. Worse, how is this enforceable if there is no database of ownership of such firearms today? A similar law in Australia found only 20% compliance across their country. Yet, law-abiding civilians use AR-design rifles for home defense, target shooting, hunting, etc.

2) Ban large capacity ammunition magazines of more than 10 rounds and that existing magazines of more than 10 rounds be destroyed, turned in to law enforcement, or removed from the state (i.e. NO GRANDFATHERING). The recently passed and controversial New York SAFE Act has just established a 7-round limit.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – MOSTLY FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – MAJOR IMPACT

None of the low-round-count events (i.e. suicide, accidents, domestic violence) will be impacted by this and criminals ignore such laws. Rampage killings with devastating lethality have taken place with limited capacity magazines (i.e. Columbine, Oikos). It is arguable whether lower capacity magazines can reduce

carnage in a rampage killing once started. Yet, over 80% of pistols sold today are designed to hold 10-rounds or more as their standard capacity. Further, how is this limit even enforceable given there is no record of ownership for the FOUR MILLION such magazines estimated to be in gun owners possession in Connecticut? More importantly, even New York State's SAFE Act allowed for the grandfathering of existing magazines because they suspected a "no grandfathering" law could be deemed unconstitutional as an uncompensated government "taking" of private property. Such a limit would severely neuter law-abiding citizens' use of self-defense pistols designed with a standard capacity of 10-rounds or more..

3) Require permits and universal background checks on ALL sales and transfers of guns, including long guns.

Suicide – FAIL on existing firearms, POSSIBLE on subsequent transfers

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL on existing firearms, POSSIBLE on subsequent transfers

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL on existing firearms, POSSIBLE on subsequent transfers

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – SOME IMPACT

Enhancing background checks has wide appeal, even among some gun owners.

However, the historical reason for requiring permit to own or carry a handgun is related to their being easily concealable, not the simple fact that they are a firearm. Authorities have deemed that in order to carry a firearm that is not readily visible to those around you (concealed carry), the owner/permittee should be subjected to a background check. Requiring a permit for the purchase of a long gun (rifle or shotgun) is a vast expansion of the State's power and goes beyond the original issue of concealment since short-barreled rifles and shotguns are heavily regulated by the Federal government (NFA 1934). Disingenuously, this requirement for a permit for purchase seems to ignore the fact that Connecticut already subjects every retail purchase of a long gun to the State's rigorous background check system as well as the 14-day waiting period. Also, such a rifle/shotgun permit would not be the equivalent of a pistol permit and would not allow the purchase of a handgun making this strictly an

inconvenience/harassment of potential rifle/shotgun purchasers. Beyond that, the efficacy of a permitting regime will only related to future retail purchases and do nothing about the existing base of firearms in the State. Moreover, the universal background check requirement will be limited only to future transfers and would not impact firearms already owned. Finally, there is resistance to such transfer tracking, if the records are kept, creates a defacto database which is akin to registration, something many gun owners fear is an infringement on their rights.

4) Require, for the purchase of any ammunition, presentation of either a permit to carry a pistol or revolver or the new rifle or shotgun permit.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – POSSIBLE IMPACT

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – MAJOR NEGATIVE IMPACT

On the surface this seems like a sensible requirement but the devil is in the details and the Democrats' proposal seems to be either ignorant or disingenuous. On the one hand, it can be argued that the purchase of center-fire handgun ammunition (i.e. .380, 9mm, .40, .45) should require the possession of a permit to own such a firearm – why does someone who is not permitted need to be buying center-fire ammunition? I can actually consider such a requirement if it were limited to CENTER-FIRE HANDGUN ammo purchases. However, the Democrats' proposal says “any ammunition” making no distinction between handgun, rifle nor shotgun rounds nor center-fire versus rimfire. An actual bill might be worded more carefully but the Democrats' choice of words has me skeptical.

For example, the lack of a distinction regarding the type of firearm for which the ammunition is most readily used means that any owner of an existing rifle or shotgun, for which no permit is required under current law nor proposed under the current proposal, will be precluded from buying ammunition in the future should a permit be required. This is a MAJOR change in the dynamic for current owners of firearms and I can not help but wonder if this is due to

ignorance on the part of the Democrat staffers who conjure up this stuff., OR, is this not a “flaw” but actually a feature and is intended to be “fixed” at some future time by requiring existing owners of long guns to get a permit for continuing to own weapons they owned prior to the effective date of this law? Which gets back to the rationale for a permit requirement for ammunition – we do not have such permit laws today for long guns because they are not concealable and are used very infrequently in street gun crimes. Thus, such permitting, whether for future purchase or continued ownership, is simply an overbearing imposition on prospective and existing long gun owners.

Also, the use of “any ammunition” seems to ignore the difference between center-fire (high power) rounds and low power rimfire rounds (.22 long rifle). This places a huge burden on the potential buyer of rimfire ammunition which is most commonly used for target shooting, small-game hunting, pest control, plinking, etc. For example, the father of a Boy Scout who owns a .22 target rifle would suddenly need a permit to purchase a 50-round box of 22LR target rounds at Walmart – how is that fair and how does that contribute to public safety?. Again, a permit requirement for the purchase of center-fire handgun ammunition might be an idea worth consideration but the devil is in the details.

5) Establish a statewide deadly weapon offender registry.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – POSSIBLE IMPACT

Street gun-crime – POSSIBLE IMPACT

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – PASS

This is an idea that seems to make sense on its surface depending on how it is used by law enforcement. If the simple use is to have such residents of the registry “check in with the local authorities where they currently reside once each year of their registration period” what good will that do if there is non-compliance? If a former offender has given up criminal activity and has “gone straight”, then there will likely be high compliance but to what benefit if the former offender will not become a future offender due to their personal choices?

Alternatively, if the former offender has reverted back to their criminal ways, why would anyone expect a high degree of compliance by folks who have decided law-breaking is not an impediment to future behavior? Such a law would have had NO impact on a rampage killing as in Newtown.

6) Clarify standards for the determination of a permit applicant's "suitability" to carry a pistol or revolver.

**Suicide – FAIL ON EXISTING HANDGUNS; FAIL ON LONG GUNS;
POSSIBLE IMPACT ON PERSPECTIVE**

**Accidents – FAIL EXISTING HANDGUNS; FAIL LONG GUNS; POSSIBLE
ON PERSPECTIVE**

**Domestic/known shooter – FAIL EXISTING HANDGUNS; FAIL LONG GUNS;
POSSIBLE ON PERSPECTIVE**

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – POSSIBLE NEGATIVE IMPACT

A true assessment of this "clarify standard" item will depend on the actual wording of a raised bill and the real-world implementation. What is troubling is the vague language used in the proposal. For example, the proposal includes "...any other factors the issuing authority reasonably believes contribute to the applicant's suitability to possess a firearm" – what does that actually mean? The "any other factors" language is quite vague and sounds like could be quite subjective and potentially open for abuse. More troubling is a disqualifying feature being "...association with persons not eligible to obtain a pistol or revolver permit..." which means what exactly? For example, consider a citizen applying for a permit who happens to have a younger brother who is "not eligible to obtain a pistol or revolver permit" due to an aggravated drunken brawl when the younger brother was in college – is that enough of a "factor" to make the law-abiding citizen deemed ineligible to get a permit? More importantly, this will only have a bearing on future permit applicants. Again, the devil is in the details.

7) Specify that individuals prohibited from possessing or purchasing firearms are also prohibited from possessing or purchasing ammunition.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – POSSIBLE IMPACT

Rampage killer – FAIL/POSSIBLE IMPACT

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – FAIL

This is too vaguely written to warrant long discussion. On the surface, it sounds like it makes sense but how is this enforced unless there is a permit requirement of the POSSESSION of a firearm, both for ammo purchase after the effective date of the law but also for all existing firearms owned prior to effective date. As with (4) above, this only works if every gun owner is permitted which then tells you those who are not, presumably including those who are “prohibited”. The only way this would be helpful is banning the possession of ammo by those prohibited from possessing a firearm. In other words, you can charge someone with a violation for illegally holding ammo even though they are not found to be holding a firearm illegally. But this puts an undo burden on all long gun owners, no?

8) Expand firearms safe storage requirements.

Suicide – POSSIBLE IMPACT

Accidents – PASS

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL/POSSIBLE IMPACT

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – POSSIBLE IMPACT

Law-abiding self-defense – POSSIBLE NEGATIVE IMPACT

This could have some real impact if full-compliance were guaranteed. However, short of draconian regular forced inspections, how can full compliance be guaranteed? Also, as Newtown showed, Mrs. Lanza either did not store her firearms securely OR her son knew the combinations to the safe or had access to the keys to the gun cases.

9) Eliminate or reconstitute the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACT

For those unfamiliar with the Board, it is a group of individuals from a range of backgrounds (LE, legal, recreational, judicial) who are tasked with reviewing appeals to decisions involving pistol permits in CT. The Board primarily reviews challenges to permit rejections where the applicant feels he was wrongly rejected. The Board listens to both sides (applicant and rejecting authority) and then decides whether a permit should be granted. My understanding is that the Board overturns rejections about 50% of the time and upholds rejections about 50% of the time. Unfortunately, the association of chief law enforcement officers which represents the chief LEOs who may be the ones rejecting the applications, wants to disband the Board because they do not like “losing” by being overturned half the time. From an appealing applicant’s perspective, the Board presents an appeals process that is relatively cost-effective and also offers a further appeal to the state’s Superior Court, if they rejected applicant has the financial and time resources of such an appeal. Elimination of the Board or reconstituting it (i.e. more sympathetic to chiefs) would leave rejected applicants with ONLY the Superior Court option which is rather expensive for citizens of modest means.

10) Prohibit the sale by dealers of handguns other than “personalized” handguns after they become commercially available.

Suicide – FAIL/POSSIBLE LONG-TERM POSITIVE IMPACT

Accidents – FAIL/POSSIBLE LONG-TERM POSITIVE IMPACT

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – FAIL/POSSIBLE LONG-TERM POSITIVE IMPACT

Rampage killer – FAIL/POSSIBLE LONG-TERM POSITIVE IMPACT

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – REALLY MAJOR NEGATIVE IMPACT

Of all the provisions in this proposal, this one is PURE FANTASY, and diminishes the credibility of the balance of the provisions. By “personalized” handguns, this refers to theoretical technology that would most likely read a gun owner’s fingerprint, check versus its “database”, confirm usage and electronically enable the firearm to be discharged. This is pure SCIENCE FICTION at this point and the technology does not exist in anything other than experimental form anywhere. Such concepts have floated around for more than a decade originating in the idea that the police should only carry weapons that can only be discharged by themselves, denying a physical assailant and opportunity to turn a cop’s gun against the officer. Some have considered this for the military as well. The problem is that the technology just does not work outside of a laboratory and it never likely to work in the real-world. The partisan gun-control community have latched on to this Star Wars worthy idea claiming that it would render stolen handguns useless in the hands of anyone other than the registered owner. Theoretically, that might be possible, however, it ignores the financial and operational impact on law-abiding gun owners. Financial because building such sensing and computing technology into a firearm will raise its cost. Operational because in times of stress, or when the user’s hands are dirty or dry, the technology fails. I use a finger-print reader everyday in my job and most days it takes more than a single reading to activate, and that is after a delay of a couple of seconds. Further, at least quarterly I have to go through a new registration process as my fingerprint changes with the seasons and the dryness of my skin. Add in dirt, sweat or gloves, and there will be no authorization. What this IS is an attempt to make conventional firearms unavailable to law-abiding citizens. The wording of this proposal tasks the state’s “Attorney General to determine when personalized pistols or revolvers are available for retail purchase”. This is hugely subjective and available for retail purchase does not mean the technology is affordable, fool-proof or even widely available. I think someone has to go back to Heller and think of Scalia’s “in common use” language and apply it to Star Wars firing systems.

11) Ban the sale of all armor piercing bullets: Currently, section 53-202l bans the sale of all armor piercing .50 caliber bullets. This proposal would ban the sale or transfer of bullets that are specifically designed to be armor piercing, regardless of caliber.

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – FAIL

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – PASS

This one is somewhat strange and worries me that this might be a backdoor to something much more insidious down the road – something worthy of Machiavelli. First, why even include this. When was the last time that any AP round was used in some gun crime in CT or elsewhere? I read quite a bit and I can not recall a single instance where LE was complaining about the availability of AP rounds. For those who are unaware, AP rounds are designed in a particular way using extremely hard metals and are designed to penetrate plate steel (armor) of vehicles or fortified facilities. In the military, they are designated anti-material rounds because they are designated primarily to penetrate engine blocks to stop vehicles or to shoot through cinder block or cement structures. An “off label” usage is anti-personnel because a 50 cal in a proper sniper configuration can shoot “soft tissue” at great distances, including well over 1,000 yards. Think of the movie “Sniper” for the risk here. However, CT already prohibits such rounds so why expand the definition from one that is caliber-specific to one that is general: “designed to be armor piercing”? can anyone show me an instance of the criminal use of a AP round chambered in something other than 50 cal, never mind 50 cal.

Here’s my concern. At a community meeting several weeks ago, Redding Chief Fuchs described a 223 round as "armor piercing" in reference to traditional patrol officer’s soft armor. When I asked him afterward why he would mislead the audience by not pointing out that the typical patrol officer’s soft armor is not meant to stop high velocity rifle rounds he was shocked that someone would challenge him on his "expertise". He never really responded but he is in fact correct, soft body armor (i.e. without rifle plates) is indeed vulnerable to the 223 round as well as just about any center-fire rifle round. My concern is that a change in definition of “armor piercing” to mean any round able to penetrate Level II or III soft armor has the ability to make illegal a wide range of everyday

hunting and target rounds. If you think this is "too far out there", BATFE is already nosing around on that subject:

<http://www.nraila.org/news-issues/articles/2012/batfe-taking-comments-on-sporting-purposes-exemption-to-armor-piercing-ammunition-law-until-dec-31.aspx>

In my opinion, anyone interested in gun owners' rights should be fighting aggressively to have this one either fully clarified or struck completely from any future bill. The Republicans should pressure the Democrats to explain who is asking for this provision, why they are asking for it, quantify the risk and discuss the potential for an overly generally interpretation. I would pay to hear that discussion.

12) The Democrats' proposal includes a lengthy discussion of a range of provisions designed to "Strengthen laws regarding firearms trafficking and straw purchases". Most of these provisions increase the penalties for violation of laws already on the books and include mandatory minimum sentences and less plea-bargaining. I am generally in favor of many of these but I would have to see the actual wording in a bill before rendering a more exacting opinion. But, I generally wonder whether the criminal element, responsible for 80%+ of non-suicide gun crime (CAGV's number) would care whether fines go from \$1,000 to \$10,000 or felony levels go from Class D to Class C? I mean, if you are trying to kill a rival gang member, robbing a liquor store with a firearms or doing some other crime that is already a Class C or higher felony, do you care about any of these increased penalties? How much of a deterrent effect can increased penalties provide? And clearly such changes will have no impact on Suicides nor Rampage Killers. So, lumping all these provisions together:

Suicide – FAIL

Accidents – FAIL

Domestic/known shooter – FAIL

Street gun-crime – POSSIBLE LONG-TERM POSITIVE IMPACT

Rampage killer – FAIL

Rampage shooting body count – FAIL

Newtown – FAIL

Law-abiding self-defense – MINOR NEGATIVE IMPACT

The greatest impact here would be on future trafficking of firearms from legal dealers to illegal hands through “straw buyers” and this would be a desirable outcome. However, it would do nothing to impact the more than 3,000,000 firearms already in the public’s hands. The one aspect that might have a marginal deterrent effect would be some of the provisions make plea-bargaining the penalties lower a bit more challenging for the courts and prosecutors; it does not prevent it but requires a public acknowledgement of the plea and the rationale. However effective that might be will only be known looking back in the future. Conversely, a minor impact could be argued on law-abiding citizens who may wish to purchase more than one firearm at a single visit to a gun store, a rather common occurrence.

I have skipped over discussion of several of the provisions that are important but beyond the scope of this review.

Facts incorporated into the above review include some statistics courtesy of the CAGV website:

- 2011 Connecticut firearms deaths totaled 216 with 102 homicides (47%) and 114 suicides (53%).**
- The homicides affected mostly minorities given 70 victims (68.6%) were African American and 16 (15.7%) were Latino; total of 84.3%.**
- The suicide data was very different as Caucasians accounted for 92.1% of the 114 suicide victims.**
- CT 2011 homicide victims were 93 male and 9 female.**
- CT 2011 suicide victims were 108 male and 6 female**
- Of 367 gun homicides committed in CT during 2008-2011, 269 or 73.3% occurred in the state’s three largest cities, Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven.**
- “Most violent gun crimes are committed by people who cannot legally own guns, usually because they are felons or because they are underage.”**
- “... in Connecticut, more than 85 percent of gun crimes are committed by people who cannot legally purchase guns.”**

Supplemental 2011 data from other sources as referenced at bottom:

- CT homicide by rifle 1 of 102 or 1% (type rifle unknown) 1
- CT family violence homicides were 18 with 5 by firearm (5% of gun homicides) 2
- National gun deaths 32,163 of which 11,101 or 38.5% homicide and 19,766 or 61.5% suicide 3
- National long-gun homicides 679 out of 11,101 total gun homicides or 6% 3
- National “unintentional” gun deaths (i.e. accidents) 851 or 2.7% 3
- National mass murder gun deaths 31 or 0.3% of all gun homicides 2
- Chicago 2011 gun homicides 441 or 4% of USA total (AP); 2012 was 535 4
- Since 1982, there have been three mass gun murders in CT: Newtown (2012; 26 dead), Hartford Distributors (2010; 8) and CT Lottery (1998; 5) 4
- Since 1997, .223/5.56 caliber bullets (AR style) used in gun crimes in Bridgeport 1.2%, “almost negligible” and “none used in serious shooting crimes” 5
- Rifles of the AR design (Armalite Rifle) have only been used in three mass shooting in USA (Newtown included) 6

1 <http://www.cagv.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/CAGV-Press-Release-1-22-2013.pdf>

2 FBI. 2013. ‘Crime in the United States / CIUS.’ Uniform Crime Reports / UCR, undated annual. Washington DC: US Federal Bureau of Investigation. 29 January 2013 via www.gunpolicy.org

3 <http://crimeinchicago.blogspot.com>

4 CT Office of Legislative Research <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2013/rpt/pdf/2013-R-0057.pdf>

5 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qOHi7ZHwPGQ>

6 <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/12/mass-shootings-mother-jones-full-data>